



JERRY V. LEAPHART & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW
8 West Street, Suite 203
Danbury, CT 06810

Tel: 203-825-6265

Facsimile: 203-825-6256

SO ORDERED**VIA FACSIMILE (212) 805-6737**

October 15, 2007

The Honorable George B. Daniels
United States District Judge
United States Courthouse
500 Pearl Street
New York, NY 10007

George B. Daniels
HON. GEORGE B. DANIELS

OCT 19 2007

RE: Dr. Morgan Reynolds, ex rel. USA v.
Science Applications International Corporation, et al
Case No. 07 CIV 4612 (GBD)

Dear Judge Daniels:

This office represents Dr. Morgan Reynolds, the plaintiff in the above cited matter.

As of this date at least four defendants have filed Motions to Dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) and 9(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Those defendants are:

Simpson, Gumpertz & Heger, Inc.
Computer Aided Engineering Associates, Inc.
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP
Applied Research Associates, Inc.

We anticipate that additional defendants will also file Motions to Dismiss.

Plaintiff requests an extension of time to file oppositions to the pending and anticipated motions to and including January 28, 2008. The original date for filing oppositions to the first filed motion is October 23, 2007. This is the first request for an extension of time filed by the plaintiff; there were no previous requests; adversaries for each of the pending motions

have been contacted, see Exhibit A, but have not yet advised of their position.

It is also asserted that this request for extension of time is consistent with the interests of "judicial economy" as that concept has been articulated in, say, Thrower v. Commissioner Roccosoizzi, et al, 2000 U.S. Dist LEXIS 1075 (GBD), in that it would permit determining whether and to what extent some oppositions might be consolidated into a single responsive pleading and/or determination. It is, however, also acknowledged that of the four (4) motions thus far filed, not all rely on either the same theory or the same precedent. For that additional reason, it is respectfully requested that no responses from plaintiff should be required until all defendants have filed their motions as plaintiff's legal strategy should not be revealed prior to all such filings. This is especially apt since, as indicated, defendants' motions are not exactly consistent, one with the other. Plaintiff should only be required to respond when all defendants have been heard from.

Respectfully submitted,



Jerry V. Leaphart

Enclosure

CC: William David Byassee, Esq.

Dina R. Jansenson, Esq.

Sean T. O'Leary, Esq.

David M. Pollack, Esq.

Philip C. Semprevivo, Esq.

Chad E. Sjoquist, Esq.

Philip Touitou, Esq.

Gail D. Ziekelbach, Esq.

Benjamin H. Torrance, Esq.

E. Leslie Hoffman, Esq.

Jason A. Harrington, Esq.

U.S. Department of Justice (via first-class mail)

(All via facsimile except as noted)



sspitcher@hotmail.com

Printed: Monday, October 15, 2007 5:06 P

-----Original Message-----

From: sally pitcher [mailto:sspitcher@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2007 3:45 PM

To: dbyassee@jacksonkelly.com; soleary@wkgi.com; dpollack@donovanhatem.com;

psemprevivo@bhmr.com; csjoquist@zdlaw.com; ptoultou@hinshawlaw.com;

gdzirkelbach@jacksonkelly.com; djansenson@fzw.com

Cc: jsleaphart@cs.com

Subject: Reynolds v. SAIC/ Case No. 1:07-CV-04612 (GBD)

Counsel:

Concurrence in an extension of time to reply to the pending and anticipated motions to dismiss for a period of up to 90 days will be requested and your agreement to this request would be appreciated. Please advise of your position on plaintiff's request for extension of time for up to 90 days on or before October 12, 2007.

Sally

Sally S. Pitcher

Assistant to Attorney Leaphart

Jerry V. Leaphart & Assoc., P.C.

8 West Street, Suite 203

Danbury, CT 06810

(203) 825-6265 - phone

(203) 825-6256 - fax

jsleaphart@cs.com

sspitcher@hotmail.com